

in two columns, and with much less waste of space for headings for sub-sections of only one or two lines, the text could have been easier to read and much more compact.

However, these matters are trivial. This book will be a blessing to people who use laboratory animals throughout the world and for many years—at least, until the next edition appears.

S. A. BARNETT

INTELLIGENCE

Shuey, Audrey M. *The Testing of Negro Intelligence*. Second enlarged edition. New York, 1966. Social Science Press. Pp. xv + 578. Price \$6.50.

TWO THINGS CAN be said at the outset about this book. First, that it is an extremely thorough and extensive survey of all the evidence derived from the testing of Negroes' intelligence in the USA from the early years of this century to the present day. Second, that it provides cold comfort for those who hold views about the innate equality of races, and attribute observed differences to lack of opportunity and privilege.

Professor Shuey is not presenting a point of view. All she believes in is evidence and logic, and the sheer weight of evidence she presents is overwhelming and is summed up on the last page by a magnificent sentence, thirty-three lines long, which begins, "The remarkable consistency in test results . . .", and ends, "all taken together, inevitably point to the presence of native differences between Negroes and whites as determined by intelligence tests".

It is impossible to summarize such an extensive review. The evidence from intelligence tests and other assessments of intellectual ability is followed through from childhood to school to high school and college, to the Armed Forces to veterans. There are also sections on the gifted, the retarded, the delinquent and the racial hybrid. Besides the cumulative effect of the evidence prescribed by Professor Shuey, these chapters are a mine of interesting miscellaneous information. For example, physical measures such as bone structure, thickness of lips, or breadth of nose did not significantly correlate with IQ among Negroes, but differences in skin colour did. Professor Shuey raises the relevant point that the "pure" Negro is rare in USA; what kind of whites mated with Negroes? Also, on common tests such as ACE, the average score of the Negro college student, presumably more highly selected than the white, was about the twelve percentile of the scores of white students; on the other hand, one study found the average intelligence of Negro criminals to be higher than that for Negroes drafted into the Armed Forces.

Professor Shuey is a demon for logic and the limits of evidence; she is also no respecter of persons or of those studies which have almost reached the status of legends. Otto Klineberg's two studies in 1935, on *Negro Intelligence and Selective Migration*, and on *Race Differences*, are subjected to careful examination, and his often quoted conclusions on the influence of Northern environment and the absence of selective migration become much less convincing. In *Differential Psychology* (1958) Anne Anastasi gives a schematic demonstration of what is meant by a 30 per cent overlap, and goes on rather rashly to say that this is close to that usually found between psychological test scores of whites and Negroes in USA. Professor Shuey responds by quoting seventy-one studies, based on 34,784 Negroes, giving an average overlap of 11 per cent. Of these, five studies, all except one before 1936, and based on 872 Negroes, reported an overlap of 30 per cent or more.

It is this meticulous and objective presentation of evidence that is the strength of the book. It is not a readable book; it falls between a reference book and a textbook. Perhaps the reader had best begin with chapter XI, Summary and Conclusions. Professor Shuey does not discuss political, social or genetic implications; but it is a pity that she did not include at least one chapter on the testing of other racial groups, especially the Chinese and

Japanese. Perhaps some humane Mikado might make this book compulsory reading for those who too readily strike doctrinaire attitudes about the intellectual abilities of American Negroes and whites.

JAMES MAXWELL

PSYCHIATRY

Lidz, Theodore, Fleck, Stephen and Cornelison, Alice K. *Schizophrenia and the Family*. New York, 1965. International Universities Press (London, Bailey Bros. and Swinfen). Pp. 477. Price 90s.

DO PARENTS BY their behaviour play any part in causing schizophrenia in their children? Or, to put the question in a more constructive form: if the children are by their natures predisposed to schizophrenia, can the parents do anything to reduce the chances of the disease?

The question is relevant because we know that heredity only accounts for a proportion of the causation of schizophrenia, and very little of the remaining proportion has been accounted for. Parental behaviour, possibly of a type associated with a schizophrenic diathesis in the parents themselves, is a factor which must be considered, along with others such as extrafamilial influences during upbringing (e.g. school and peer relationships), stress at the time of onset of the disease (e.g. unsuitable vocational or marital situation), and what Waddington in *The Strategy of the Genes** has called "intangible internal sources of variation" or "developmental noise".

To assess the importance of family upbringing, it is really necessary either to vary the upbringing experimentally (for instance by allocating "high risk" families randomly to a group given special training in child rearing and a control group) or to study children brought up apart from their biological parents. The former has not been attempted. The latter is fraught with practical difficulties in most countries, and only recently has relevant information become available. Karlsson reported in *The Biological Basis of Schizophrenia*† that children of schizophrenics brought up in foster homes are no less likely to develop schizophrenia than those reared in the schizophrenic milieu; and Shields in *Recent Developments in Schizophrenia*‡ has assembled evidence to show that the schizophrenia concordance rate for MZ twins reared apart does not differ much from that of MZ twins reared together.

In the absence of any definite knowledge, it is not surprising that widely divergent views have been held. The approach of Professor Lidz and his colleagues is of particular interest because it is so different from the mainstream of psychiatric thought in this country (although it has affinities with our Existentialist school). Extending the theory and methods of psychoanalysis from the individual to the family, they take the view that schizophrenia is a defence against an intolerable life situation, an escape into delusional beliefs, which however is not possible for everyone, but only for those who have been brought up in a family atmosphere of irrational thinking.

The object of their investigation was to explore the families of schizophrenic patients in depth, to see what sort of family psychopathology they could find. The probands were seventeen young upper-class schizophrenics admitted to the Yale Psychiatric Institute, and they and most of the members of their families had intensive investigation, in many cases weekly for several years. The authors must surely be justified in their claim that this is the most intensively studied series of families ever reported for any reason.

They found that practically all the first degree relatives were abnormal. Many were overtly schizophrenic, others were severely obsessional or alcoholic. As there was no control series of families, it is idle to speculate on why they found a very much higher incidence of

* 1957. Allen and Unwin.

† 1966. Charles C. Thomas.

‡ Ed. A. J. Coppen. Royal Medico-Psychological Association.